

REMARKS

Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated June 4, 2007, Applicants have amended the abstract and added claim 6. Support for new dependent claim 6 is found in, for example, pg. 16, line 2 to pg. 17, line 30; Fig. 14 of the originally filed specification. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter. Claims 1-2 are withdrawn. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Specification

The Abstract was objected to for containing legal phraseology. In response, the Applicants have amended the abstract.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,258,480 (hereinafter Moriwaki). The Office Action asserts that Moriwaki teaches a manufacturing method for an anode can of a battery by preparing a material corresponding to the shape of the can and forming a cylindrical body by deforming. The Office Action also asserts that Moriwaki teaches that the sidewall thickness is subjected to press working to form a large thickness portion at the end portion and a small thickness.

Turning to the prior art, Moriwaki describes a Drawing and Ironing method (**DI processing**) for manufacturing a battery (col. 6, lines 30-32). Moriwaki discusses punching a sheet containing an Aluminum-Manganese based alloy into a circular shape (col. 6, lines 20-26).

Moriwaki describes drawing the sheet using a press to manufacture a metal case cup 3 having a bottom with an external diameter of 21.5 mm and a height of 15.5 mm (Fig. 2; col. 6, lines 26-28). Moriwaki describes introducing the metal case cup 3 into a **DI metal mold**, where a DI metal case having a bottom of external diameter 13.8 mm, and a height of 54.0 mm was manufactured by continuous ironing (col. 6, lines 30-33; Fig. 2). Moriwaki states in col. 6, lines 34-38:

Since, in this condition, an upper side part (lug) 5 of the metal case *is not level, but has a somewhat distorted shape due to the processing, a DI metal case having a bottom, i.e., metal case 1 of external diameter 13.8 mm, height 49.0 mm was formed by cropping upper side part 5.* Fig. 1 shows a cross-sectional view of this metal case 1 having a bottom (*emphasis added*).

According to the claimed subject matter per independent claim 3, the sidewall of the anode can is subjected to two steps, specifically, a thickness modifying step of forming a large thickness portion and a small thickness portion in the sidewall of the anode can, and a working step of making the large thickness portion *project inward* by using a mold for press working (*see, e.g.,* Fig. 14; pg. 14, lines 17-23). However, Moriwaki does not disclose or suggest this, and apparently is unaware of the unexpected improvement in the manufacturing process by reducing the occurrence of a flaw or the like in the small thickness portion following the step of subjecting the sidewall to press working so that a distance between an outer circumferential surface of the large thickness portion and the central axis is equal to a distance between an outer circumferential surface of the small thickness portion and the central axis.

Thus, Moriwaki is *silent* on modifying a thickness by subjecting the sidewall to “press working” as required by claim 3. As a result, Moriwaki fails to disclose or suggest, at a minimum, “...subjecting said sidewall to press working so that a distance between an outer circumferential surface of said large thickness portion and said central axis is equal to a distance

between an outer circumferential surface of said small thickness portion and said central axis, and a distance between an inner circumferential surface of said large thickness portion and said central axis is smaller than a distance between an inner circumferential surface of said small thickness portion and said central axis,” as recited in claim 3.

New Claim

New claim 6 recites in part, “...inserting said punch into said opening together with said cylindrical body, a distance between an inner circumferential surface of said opening of said die and said central axis is equal to a distance between an outer circumferential surface of the anode can to be produced and said central axis, and a distance between an outer circumferential surface of said punch and said central axis is equal to a distance between the inner circumferential surface of said large thickness portion and said central axis.” Nothing in the cited reference teaches or suggests the described subject matter. It is submitted that this new dependent claim is distinguishable over the cited reference.

Conclusion


In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Application No.: 10/765,933

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


Lisa A. Kilday
Registration No. 56,210

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/LAK
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: September 4, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**